

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, the abstract and claims 1, 3, 15 and 17 have been amended. Claims 2 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-5, 15 and 17 are pending and under consideration.

### AMENDMENT TO THE ABSTRACT

The abstract has been amended to conform to the claimed subject matter of the present application.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 112

Claims 1-5 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner noted that the term “speed interface unit” recited in claims 1 and 15 was not defined in the specification. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to replace “speed interface unit” with terminology used in paragraph [0005] of the specification.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 102

Claims 1-5 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradford (US 3,423,524) (hereinafter “Bradford”).

Amended independent claim 1 recites: “...a decoder which detects an identifying signal indicating a transmission speed of the received signal, provides the detected identifying signal to the clock generator, transmits the received signal to the recording processing unit, and the clock generator generates the clock signal that is synchronized with the identifying signal...”

Amended independent claim 15 recites: “...wherein the generating the clock signal comprises detecting an identifying signal capable of indicating the transmission speed of the received signal and generating a clock signal that is synchronized with the identifying signal.”

Support for these amendments to claims 1 and 15 may be found in at least original claims 2 and 16, respectively.

Amended claims 1 and 15 recite a technical feature where a decoder **detects an identifying signal indicating a transmission speed** of the received signal from the received signal.

The grounds of rejection for this feature are found in the Office Action mailed March 17, 2008. Specifically, the Examiner relies on 10:32-10:44 of Bradford to show this feature of claims 1 and 15.

Bradford discusses at 10:32-10:44 that a composite video signal source 44 may be a television receiver, a output signal 44' of the composite video signal source 44 is a demodulated video signal in the form of an envelope type wave train and then the output signal 44' is fed to a synch pulse separator 45 producing at its output signals representing the train of horizontal synch pulses.

However, it respectfully submitted that this, or any other, portion of Bradford does not disclose the technical feature of detecting an identifying signal indicating a **transmission speed** of the received signal from the received signal, as recited in claims 1 and 15 of the present application.

Further, claims 1 and 15 have been clarified to recite that the received signal is from a channel receiver without a medium between the channel receiver and the disc drive to interface the transmission speed of the received signal outputted from the channel receiver with a recording speed of the disc drive which is a further feature of claims 1 and 15 not realized by Bradford because Bradford contains numerous mediums to interface the transmission speed of the received signal outputted from the video signal source 44 with a recording speed of the disc drive.

This technical feature of claims 1 and 15 provides for controlling a recording speed of data and a rotation speed of a spindle motor to adapt to a transmission speed of received data, thereby normally recording data received from a channel receiver on a disc without connecting an additional medium between the channel receiver and the disc drive. In addition, any additional tasks required to provide the medium are not necessary, and transmission errors such as a buffer underrun can be prevented from occurring, which are technical advantages not realized by Bradford.

Claims 2 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 3-5 and 17 depend on one of claims 1 and 15, respectively, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 14, 2009

By: Gregory W. Harper  
Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501